REMARKS

1.   Summary of the Office Action

In the Office action mailed April 30, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 12-21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell et al. (U.S. 5,223,827) (hereinafter referred to as Bell) in view of Andersen (U.S. 6,434,715 B1) and Vaid et al. (U.S. 6,502,131 B1) (hereinafter referred to as Vaid).

2.   Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 12-21, and 23 are presently pending. Of these claims, 1, 8, 21 and 23 are in independent format, and the rest are in dependent format.

3.   Summary of the Prior Art

a.   Bell

Bell discloses determining the occurrence of an event, and then determining if the number of events in a given time frame exceeds a threshold. If the threshold is exceeded, the system may then take an action. "Typically, this might be the generation of a message containing parameters of interest for this type of event and the transmission of the message . . ." *See* Bell, col. 5, lines 48-51; col. 6, lines 39-42.

b.   Andersen

Andersen discloses sending two messages: an event message, and a corresponding repeat event message. *See* Andersen, col. 3, lines 9-13; col. 3, lines 58-62. Event messages are sent when an event is detected. *Id.* Further, a given event message is sent regardless of whether the event is later determined to be a repeat event. *Id.* After the event message is sent, Andersen then determines whether the event is a repeat event. If determined to be a repeat event, a repeat event message is then sent.

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606
TELEPHONE (312) 913-0001

8

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 01-491
S/N: 09/897,518
FILING DATE: JULY 2, 2001

Although there may be a limit as to the number of repeat event messages sent, Andersen discloses that an event message is sent when the event is detected, regardless of whether the repeat event message limit has been reached.

c.   Vaid

Vaid discloses a method for monitoring the quality of service of information sources in a network of computers. *See* Vaid, Abstract. In particular, Vaid discloses sending alarms and notifications in the form of an SNMP message. *Id.* at col. 27, lines 52-55.

4.   Response to Rejections

a.   Response to 103(a) Rejection of Claims 1 and 21

The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1 and 21 because Bell, the primary reference does not teach all the elements of the pending claims, and Andersen, the secondary reference cited by the Examiner, is also deficient because it teaches away from the remaining claimed elements. The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) on grounds of obviousness based on Bell, Andersen, and Vaid. The Examiner concedes that the Bell reference does not explicitly teach the element of "maintaining an event log display by excluding an indication of the event from the event log display when (i) the event corresponds to an already recurring event and (ii) the number of preceding equivalent events is greater than the predetermined number in the preceding time period." *See* Claims 1 and 21. Nevertheless, the Examiner contends that this element is rendered obvious to one skilled in the art by the Andersen reference. However, contrary to the Examiner's contention, Anderson teaches away from this claimed element by disclosing

sending an event message each time an event is detected, regardless of whether the event is determined to be a repeat event. *See* Andersen, col. 3, lines 9-13.

As conceded by the Examiner, Bell fails to teach "maintaining the event log display by excluding an indication of the event from the event log display when (i) the event corresponds to an already recurring event and (ii) the number of preceding equivalent events is greater than the predetermined number in the preceding time period." As noted above, when an event has been determined to occur beyond a threshold number, Bell discloses the "generation of a message containing parameters of interest for this type of event and the transmission of the message . . . ." *See* Bell, col. 5, lines 48-51. However, while Bell does disclose determination of a threshold number of events, Bell makes no mention of maintaining an event log display by excluding indications of events, or ignoring conditions associated with recurring events.

Andersen not only fails to make up for this deficiency in Bell, but in fact teaches away from the claimed element. Andersen discloses sending an event message each time an event is detected, regardless of whether the event is determined to be a repeat event, and regardless of whether the limit has been reached for sending repeat event messages. *See* Andersen, col. 3, lines 9-13. In the portion cited by the Examiner, Andersen discloses the generation of repeat event messages, but makes no mention of the *exclusion* of indications of normal events from an event log display. Andersen, col. 2, lines 8-18. As such, Andersen fails to disclose, motivate, or render obvious, and in fact teaches away from "maintaining the event log display by excluding an indication of the event from the event log display when (i) the event corresponds to an already recurring event and (ii) the number of preceding equivalent events is greater than the predetermined number in the preceding time period."

Furthermore, Vaid fails to make up for the deficiency in Bell and Andersen. Although Vaid discloses sending notifications in the form of SNMP messages, Vaid fails to disclose "maintaining the event log display by excluding an indication of the event from the event log display when (i) the event corresponds to an already recurring event and (ii) the number of preceding equivalent events is greater than the predetermined number in the preceding time period."

Given that the combination of Bell, Andersen, and Vaid fails to disclose "maintaining the event log display by excluding an indication of the event from the event log display when (i) the event corresponds to an already recurring event and (ii) the number of preceding equivalent events is greater than the predetermined number in the preceding time period," a *prima facie* case of obviousness of the claims over the references does not exist. Nevertheless, Applicants have modified Claims 1 and 21 to elucidate this distinction from the prior art. Claims 1 and 21, as modified, specifically teach exclusion of a normal event log entry from an event log display, which has not been disclosed in Andersen, Bell, or Vaid. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 21 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

b.   Response to 103(a) Rejection of Claim 8

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) on grounds of obviousness based on Bell, Andersen, and Vaid. Specifically, the Examiner contends that Bell teaches "receiving network management data relating to an event condition; and determining whether the monitored characteristic for the event condition is in a recurring state, and processing the data according to whether the monitored characteristic for the event condition is in a recurring state." Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, because the combination of

Bell, Andersen, and Vaid fails to disclose the element of "responsive to determining that the event condition has occurred more than the first predetermined number of times in the first preceding time period, preventing the received data relating to the event condition from being presented in the event log display to the user." *See* Claim 8.

While Bell does disclose transmitting a message when the number of occurrences of an event exceeds a threshold, it fails to disclose "responsive to determining that the event condition has occurred more than the first predetermined number of times in the first preceding time period, preventing the received data relating to the event condition from being presented in the event log display to the user." The Examiner cites to the abstract and other portions in Bell, and concludes that this reference discloses that data may be processed according to whether the monitored event is in a recurring state. However, while the abstract does suggest that "some type of action" may be performed in "response to detection" of an "event threshold", this vague language does not teach "responsive to determining that the event condition has occurred more than the first predetermined number of times in the first preceding time period, preventing the received data relating to the event condition from being presented in the event log display to the user." *See* Bell, Abstract; col. 1 lines 15-62; *see also* Claim 8.

Andersen fails to make up for this deficiency in Bell, and is also inapposite to the teaching of the claimed element. Since Andersen discloses sending an event message each time an event is detected, regardless of whether the event is determined to be a repeat event, and regardless of whether the limit has been reached for sending repeat event messages, Andersen fails to disclose and is inapposite to "responsive to determining that the event condition has occurred more than the first predetermined number of times in the first

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone (312) 913-0001

12

Attorney Docket No.: 01-491
S/N: 09/897,518
Filing Date: July 2, 2001

preceding time period, preventing the received data relating to the event condition from being presented in the event log display to the user." *See* Andersen, col. 3, lines 9-13.

Moreover, for the reasons stated above, Vaid fails to make up for this deficiency in Bell and Andersen. Given that the combination of Bell, Andersen, and Vaid fail to disclose "responsive to determining that the event condition has occurred more than the first predetermined number of times in the first preceding time period, preventing the received data relating to the event condition from being presented in the event log display to the user," a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 8 over the combination of references does not exist. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

c. Response to 103(a) Rejection of Dependent Claims 4, 5, and 12-20

Without addressing the Examiner's statements regarding the pending dependent claims 4, 5, and 12-20, which are not conceded, Applicants point out that each of these claims depend from and incorporate the limitations from at least one of independent claims 1, 8, and 21, which, as discussed above, are allowable over the cited art. Accordingly, claims 4, 5, and 12-20 are allowable for at least the reason that they each depend from an allowable claim. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of the pending dependent claims.

5. Conclusion

The Applicants submit that the application is in good and proper form for allowance and respectfully request the Examiner to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of

McDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606
TELEPHONE (312) 913-0001

13

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 01-491
S/N: 09/897,518
FILING DATE: JULY 2, 2001

the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the

Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at 312-913-3305.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Date: July 30, 2007   By: /Robert J. Irvine III/
                                              Robert J. Irvine III
                                              Registration No. 41,865